UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.           | FILING DATE                   | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/573,406                | 03/27/2006                    | Koichi Watanabe      | 017447-0194         | 2973             |
|                           | 7590 12/21/201<br>LARDNER LLP | EXAMINER             |                     |                  |
| SUITE 500                 | T NIW                         | BERMAN, JASON        |                     |                  |
| 3000 K STREE<br>WASHINGTO |                               |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|                           |                               |                      | 1724                |                  |
|                           |                               |                      |                     |                  |
|                           |                               |                      | MAIL DATE           | DELIVERY MODE    |
|                           |                               |                      | 12/21/2010          | PAPER            |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s)    |  |  |
|-----------------|-----------------|--|--|
| 10/573,406      | WATANABE ET AL. |  |  |
| Examiner        | Art Unit        |  |  |
| Jason M. Berman | 1724            |  |  |

|   | Jason M. Berman  | 1724  |                               |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|---|-------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe   | ars on the cover sheet with the c  | correspondence add  | ress                          |  |  |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>22 November 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS   | APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO  | OR ALLOWANCE.   |                               |  |  |  |  |
| 1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:   | ring replies: (1) an amendment, aff<br>ice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c    | idavit, or other eviden<br>compliance with 37 Cl          | ce, which<br>FR 41.31; or (3) |  |  |  |  |
| a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A  | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth                                      |   |                               |  |  |  |  |
| no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la<br>Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (<br>TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70   | b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE  | •   |                               |  |  |  |  |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL  |  |   |                               |  |  |  |  |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS  | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to  | avoid dismissal of the                                    |                               |  |  |  |  |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below   | nsideration and/or search (see NO w);  | TE below);  |                               |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet<br/>appeal; and/or</li> <li>(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a contract of the c</li></ul> |  |   | he issues for                 |  |  |  |  |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  | serresponding names of imally reg  | ootoa olamio.   |                               |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li> <li>5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ul>   | ·  |   |                               |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al<br/>non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>  | lowable if submitted in a separate,  | timely filed amendme                                      | nt canceling the              |  |  |  |  |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  |  | ll be entered and an e                                    | xplanation of                 |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:  |  |   |                               |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE   |  |   |                               |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu<br/>because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and<br/>was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>  | t before or on the date of filing a No<br>d sufficient reasons why the affidav | otice of Appeal will <u>no</u><br>it or other evidence is | t be entered<br>necessary and |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing<br/>entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o<br/>showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>  | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under apper<br>and was not earlier presented. S  | al and/or appellant fai<br>ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1           | s to provide a<br>).          |  |  |  |  |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation<br>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER   | n of the status of the claims after e  | ntry is below or attach                                   | ed.                           |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bu<br/><u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>   |  | n condition for allowar                                   | ce because:                   |  |  |  |  |
| 12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)  13. ☑ Other: Applicant's request for indication of foreign priority has been noted and any future office actions will indicate the receipt  |  |   |                               |  |  |  |  |
| of a certified copy of the foreign priory document on 3/27/06.  | y nas been noted and any future o  | Tice actions will indica                                  | ate the receipt               |  |  |  |  |
| /Nam X Nguyen/<br>Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1753  |  |   |                               |  |  |  |  |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues in the remarks that the applied prior art, Ceasar, Kanzaki and Mitsui, are not combinable as suggested in the prior office actions because of the differences between the prior art and the instant claims. As discussed in the prior office action, Mitsui is relied upon for its teachings of the desirability of a high density target, including that of a target containing silicon (col 2 lines 59-61: increased density for stability of discharge during film formation). Matsui additionally gives an example target with a relative density of 100% (col 2 lines 52-54). As pointed out by the Applicant, Matsui is not, however, directed towards the creation of a pure silicon target. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that the benefits of high density, as disclosed in the Silicon and Carbon containing target of Matsui, would be applicable to other targets, such as the Silicon target of Ceasar.

Applicant further argues that the combination of Kanzaki with Cesar is improper, because although Kanzaki discloses the claimed crystal orientations, Kanzaki is directed towards a metallic copper target. As previously discussed, Kanzaki discloses the application of the invention to other FCC type materials (col 1 lines 8-12). It would therefore be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the beneficial crystal orientations of Kanzaki could be applied to the Silicon target of Secar, because Silicon is similarly a FCC material.